DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 574 CG 024 951

AUTHOR Lichtenberg, James W.; And Others
TITLE Sexual Coercion and Aggression on Campus: Characteristics of Offenders.
PUB DATE Aug 93
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (101st, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 20-24, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aggression; Beliefs; College Students; Dating (Social); Higher Education; *Males; Moral Values; *Personality Traits; *Sexual Abuse; *Sexuality; Social Attitudes; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the social, moral/ethical, and personality characteristics, and the social beliefs/attitudes differentiating male college students who engage in sexual assault or coercion from those who do not. Subjects consisted of a random sample of 243 male university students. The Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss & Oros, 1982) was used to group subjects into a sexually assaultive/coercive group and a nonassaultive/coercive group. An ethical positions questionnaire (EPQ; Forsyth, 1980), a narcissism scale (NS; Phares & Erskine, 1984), a sexual attitudes questionnaire (SREPQ; Stanford Rape Education Project, 1988), and selected personality dimensions from the California Psychological Inventory (CPI-v.1, v.2, v.3; Gough, 1987) were analyzed to investigate the relationships among the students' self-reported sexual conduct, ethical positions, personality type and integration, and attitudes toward coercive sex and the characteristics of males who report differing types/degrees of sexual aggression. Of the 234 subjects, 27% were found to be sexually assaultive/coercive and 73% were sexually nonassaultive/coercive. Men in the sexually assaultive/coercive group, in contrast to those in the nonassaultive/coercive group, were more egocentric/narcissistic, more external in their orientation, and less integrated. A discriminant function formed on the basis of the subjects' scores on the EPQ, NS, and scales v.1, v.2 and v.3 of the CPI, accurately classified 66% of the subjects according to their level of sexual aggression/coercion. Sexual attitudes and histories differentiating the two groups were also studied. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 360 574

Sexual Coercion and Aggression on Campus:

Characteristics of Offenders

James W. Lichtenberg Barrie Mariner Arachtingi Carie Rodgers

University of Kansas

Running head: Sexual aggression

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, August, 1993, Toronto, CANADA. This study was supported, in part, by University of Kansas General Research Fund allocation #3477-X0-0038.

CG024951

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Lichtenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study investigated the social, moral/ethical and personality characteristics, and social beliefs/attitudes differentiating male college students who engage in sexual assault or coercion from those who do not. Subjects consisted of a random sample of 243 male university students. The Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss & Oros, 1982) was used to group Ss into a sexually assaultive/coercive group and an nonassaultive/coercive group. An ethical positions questionnaire (EPQ; Forsyth, 1980), a narcissism scale (NS; Phares & Erskine, 1984), a sexual attitudes questionnaire (SREPQ; Stanford Rape Education Project, 1988) used in the Stanford Rape Education Project (see College Security Report, 1989), and selected personality dimensions from the California Psychological Inventory (CPI-v.1, v.2, v.3; Gough, 1987) were analyzed to investigate (a) the relationships among the students' self-reported sexual conduct, ethical positions, personality type and integration, and attitudes toward coercive sex, and (b) the characteristics of males who report differing types/degrees of sexual aggression. Of the 234 Ss, 27% were found to be sexually assaultive/coercive and 73% were sexually nonassaultive/coercive. Men in the sexually assaultive/coercive group, in contrast to those in the nonassaultive/coercive group, were (a) more egocentric/narcissistic; (b) more external in their orientation, and (c) less integrated. A discriminant function formed on the basis of the Ss' scores on the EPQ, NS, and scales v.1, v.2 and v.3 of the CPI, accurately classified 66% of the Ss according to their level of sexual aggression/coercion. Sexual attitudes and histories differentiating the two groups were also studied.

Sexual Coercion and Aggression on Campus: Characteristics of Offenders

This study investigated the social, moral/ethical, and personality characteristics, and the social beliefs/attitudes differentiating male students who are sexually assaultive or coercive in their relationships with women (including date and acquaintance rape) from those who are not, in order to identify those individuals in the university setting who are likely to perpetrate acts of sexual violence. In a recent survey of over 6000 students from 32 colleges across the country, one out of every six female students reported being a victim of rape or attempted rape during the preceding year (Adams & Abarbanel, 1988; also see Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski., 1987). That same survey suggested that one out of every 15 male students in the survey reported committing rape or attempting to commit rape during that same period. A more recent and highly publicized study conducted at Stanford University found that 34% of the female graduate students and 27% of the female undergraduate students indicated that they had been coerced into sex--with the majority of those assaults taking place while at college (College Security Report, October, 1989; also see Miller & Marshall, 1987; Aizenman & Kelley, 1988). Thus, it is evident that rape and other forms of sexual assault or "coercive sex" pose a major threat to female college students. Significantly, although some of the assaults are committed by strangers, the majority (98%, College Security Report, October, 1989; also see Renner & Wackett, 1987) are perpetrated by someone the victim knows, often a fellow student. These non-stranger crimes are called "acquaintance rapes" or "date rapes" (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987).

Sexual assault victims experience profound emotional trauma. Although victims react in different ways, common responses include initial feelings of shock and disbelief; intense fears about personal safety; preoccupation with recurrent, intrusive thoughts about assault; sleep disturbance; anxiety; impaired concentration; mood swings; depression; and feelings of anger, shame and self-blame. These reactions are often referred to as "rape

trauma syndrome" or "post-traumatic stress disorder" (Benson, Charlton & Goodhart, 1992). The outcomes of sexual assaults on campus are tragic. Students are affected psychologically, socially, academically, and developmentally.

The literature addressing the issue of campus rapes has focused largely on the female victim of the assault-- the psychological effects of the trauma (e.g., feelings of victimization, attributions of responsibility and self-blame, self-esteem) (see Clagett, 1988; Jenkins & Dambrot, 1987; Koss, Dinero, Seibel & Cox, 1988; Tetreault & Barnett, 1987). Other literature has discussed campus programs designed to educate women on how to avoid rape (e.g., Adams & Abarbanel, 1988; Borden, Karr & Caldwell-Colbert, 1988; Cohen, 1984; Floerchinger, 1988; Hughes & Sander, 1987; Levine-MacCombie & Koss, 1986; Miller, 1988; Neff, 1988; Torrey & Lee, 1987). With particular regard to the latter literature, the educational and institutional responses to rape prevention have focused largely on (a) the establishment of specific campus policy prohibiting rape and sexual assault, (b) informational presentations by campus rape support services on the prevalence of campus rape and date/acquaintance rape, "resistance" strategies, precautionary or self-protective measures, and (c) modification in the campus environment (e.g., campus emergency phones, enhanced campus lighting, etc.).

Although the literature has attempted to examine the differences between college men and women in their attitudes toward and perceptions of rape (Byers, 1988; Campus Security Report, 1989; Dull & Giacopassi, 1987; Speas & Thorpe, 1979; Tetreault & Barnett, 1987), little attention has been given to the perpetrators of such assaults and the cognitive, social, moral/ethical, personality processes and characteristics and social beliefs/attitudes that allow these men to commit and to "justify" such actions. What research has been conducted generally has been based on small clinical populations of prison inmates in counseling (a) who, in addition to rape, are likely to have exhibited a variety of other assaultive and other criminal behaviors and (b) who may be characterized as either sociopathic or psychopathic (e.g., Scully & Marjolla, 1984). What this research

has found is that men who admit to raping women attempt to justify their behavior by saying that (a) even if their behavior was not "right," it was at least situationally appropriate, (b) "she got what she deserved," and (c) their substance abuse was a factor in the rape.

The use of such "justifications" may characterize the college male who coerces his date or companion into sex. However, it is not clear that this is necessarily the case--especially in instances of "coercion," rather than physical force, to gain sexual contact. Further, is it not clear, nor does it seem reasonable to assume, despite the nature of this violence against another, that college male perpetrators of coercive sex and acquaintance rape are "sick" or psychopathic. Although it has been assumed that men who rape are psychologically maladjusted individuals, psychological tests of convicted rapists have provided inconclusive support for this position (Predue & Lester, 1972; Rader, 1977). Further, despite the assumption that perpetrators of other forms of sexual assault are psychologically disturbed individuals, research has not supported the assumption that they are different from "normal" men (Cornett & Shuntich, 1991).

A study of 71 self-disclosed date rapists (Kanin, 1984) found that subjects characteristically came from middle class backgrounds (75 percent), and the majority were college students (82 percent). Excluding six of the subjects, the group studied looked like "typical" college students. Importantly, these males did not exhibit impulsive behavior or criminal tendencies which have typically been reported for convicted rapists. This group of rapists reported that they planned or hoped for a seduction but did not plan to rape anyone. In addition, when this group of rapists was compared to 227 never married, undergraduates, the findings revealed they were exposed to highly erotic-oriented peer group socialization which began in junior high and high school. Further, this group was much more sexually active on the whole than the controls.

Some studies have found certain characteristics of males that seem to correlate with a higher incidence of sexual assault. For example, Koss and Dinero (1989) found that

males who engaged in sexual aggression were more likely to have hostile feelings toward women and had more early sexual experiences. Sexual aggression has also been associated with a lack of social conscience, irresponsibility (Rapaport & Burkhart, 1984), and a need for dominance over partners (Malamuth, 1986).

Additional factors such as males' perceived rights after paying for a date, alcohol use, and engaging in the use of pornography have also contributed to a higher incidence of sexual assault. Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) report that men who initiate a date, pay all expenses, and provide transportation have been found to be more sexually aggressive than those who do not. They speculate that this may be related to the issue of dominance and control over partners. Abbey (1991) has noted that the use of alcohol increases the chances that sexual intent will be misperceived and that intoxication may be used to justify inappropriate sexual behavior. In this regard, Koss (1988) has found that alcohol use was one of the strongest predictors of acquaintance rape. In another study (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987), 26% of males who acknowledged engaging in sexual assault reported being intoxicated at the time. In addition, a correlation has been found between sexual assault and the use of violent and degrading pornography (Koss & Dinero, 1989).

Despite the a conclusion that there are is no clear empirical support regarding discrete and distinguishing characteristics of sexual offenders, the fact remains that the incidence of sexual aggression among males is high. Forty-four percent of women across the country have reported unwanted sexual contact as a result of coercion (Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski, 1987). In the same study, 19% of the males admitted to perpetrating acts of sexual aggression. Those respondents who actually engaged in sexually aggressive behavior also indicated that each act had occurred an average 2.0-3.2 times since the age of fourteen. In their sample of 2, 972 college males, Koss et al. (1987) found that 7.2% of males admitted sexual coercion, 3.3% admitted attempted rape, and 4.4% admitted rape. Additional inquiries regarding the preponderance of sexual coercion have found that 35% of college men admitted that, under certain circumstances, they would commit rape if they

thought they could get away with it (Malamuth, 1981). It has also been found that one in twelve males (8.3%) have engaged in behavior that would meet the legal definition of rape (Koss & Dinero, 1989).

Although the rate of reported incidences of sexual assault is high, the research literature reveals a significant lack of clarity regarding characteristics of sexually aggressive college males. Rape, like any complex behavior, has multiple causes and is influenced by a number of social and personal factors. In order to understand the character of coercive sex on campus, it is necessary to study that phenomenon--rather than simply generalize from potentially disparate populations.

In this regard, rather than focusing on (a) the victim of sexual assault--which generally includes the goal of assisting the victim in reestablishing control (a strategy which, paradoxically, also potentially leads the victim to limiting her own freedom of action)--a "victimology" perspective, or (b) the university environment--which generally includes goals of environmental control, policy development, and punitive expulsion of offenders (the latter reflecting a "criminology" perspective), this study focused on the perpetrator so as to more appropriately recognize factors influencing the action of the these individuals and thereby allow for the development of intervention strategies (rather than simply punitive or "avoidance" strategies) for universities. Specifically, this study investigated differences between college men who do and do not engage in coercive or assaultive sexual contact with women. These differences were investigated in terms of their subscription to various ethical positions, their sense of selfism or narcissism, and their introversive/extroversive and norm-following/norm-questioning personality orientations. Differences were also explored between these two groups on a variety of sexual experience and sexual attitude measures .

Although female students may take steps to avoid (or decrease the likelihood of) rape--and as already noted, this has been the focus of most campus educational programs addressing this issue--steps toward understanding and modifying the character of the

perpetrator may shift the focus of our educational efforts from those which, by design, perpetuate the female as victim, to those addressing the "cause" of the problem (i.e., the perpetrator of the sexual violence).

Method

Subjects

One thousand (1000) males were randomly selected from the student database of a major midwestern university in accordance with the policies of its Division of Student Affairs and with the cooperation of its Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The sample included only undergraduate students across schools/colleges within the university. In order to assure a degree of homogeneity among the sample of students, which needed to assure interpretability of findings, "non-traditional" students (i.e., undergraduates over the age of 24) were not included in the sample. In addition, because the items and normative considerations of several of the instruments may be culturally biased, students who were designated in the student database as international students were excluded from the sample.

Of the 1000 students sampled (i.e., those to whom research materials were distributed), 247 (24.7%) returned materials. Given the personally sensitive nature of the information requested from the sample, personally identifying information was not collected from those who returned materials; thus, no follow-up of unreturned materials was attempted. Of the 247 who returned materials, 13 were dropped from the study due to incomplete or incorrectly completed materials, resulting in a total valid sample of 234 (23.4% of the initial sample). This return approximated the 27.9% return on a shorter survey on sexual violence that had been conducted the previous year by the university's Division of Student Affairs. Considering the length of time required of students to complete the materials (approximately 45 minutes), the personally sensitive nature of the materials, and that no follow-up was undertaken, the 23.4% return rates was considered reasonable for this study. The mean age of the subjects was 20.5 years (SD=1.5; range=18-24). The distribution of students by class (freshman=19.1%;

sophomore=22.6%; junior=19.6%; senior=23.9%; 5th-year senior=14.8%) within this final sample closely approximated the distribution of male students within the university as a whole, with the exception that seniors were somewhat overrepresented in the sample, while 5th-year seniors were somewhat underrepresented. Eighty-nine percent of the subjects were White, 1% were Native American, 3% were Asian American, 2% were Black, 2% were Hispanic, and 3% were "other" or did not respond to this question. In terms of the Ss' sexual orientation, 84.6% indicated that they were heterosexual, 3.8% indicated that they were primarily heterosexual with occasional homosexual experiences, 1.7% indicated that they were bisexual, 3% indicated that they were primarily homosexual with occasional heterosexual experiences, 2.1% indicated that they were homosexual, and 4.7% indicated that they were "not sure" or else declined to respond to the question. Seventy-one percent of the respondents indicated that they were, or had been, sexually active; 17.5% indicated they were not, and had not been sexually active; 11.5% did not respond to this question.

Instruments

Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss & Oros, 1982). The original version of the SES consisted of descriptions of 13 circumstances under which sexual intercourse could occur that vary in the degree to which sexual coercion or aggression is present. These original 13 items "were reworded slightly to increase clarity, improve consistency with the legal definition of rape, and reflect more degrees of sexual aggression and victimization" (Koss & Gidycz, 1985, p. 422). Subjects respond to the items using a yes-no format. Koss and Gidycz report the internal consistency (alpha) of the scale for men (N=143) to be .89, and the one-week test-retest reliability (mean item agreement between scale administrations) on a sample of 67 men to be 93%. They also report the Pearson correlation between men's level of aggression as described on the SES and as given in the presence of an interviewer to be .61.

Scoring of the SES permits the grouping of respondents into groups which are distinguished in terms of degree of sexual coercion or aggression expressed or evidenced by them. Koss and her colleagues (Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski, 1987; Koss & Dinero, 1989) have used the SES to group individuals into those who (a) have committed rape, (b) have attempted rape, (c) have been sexually coercive, (d) have had noncoercive sexual contact, and (e) are sexually nonaggressive. For the present study (see Analysis section below), subjects were divided into only two groups--based on the above mentioned groupings: men whose responses indicated them to have been aggressive or coercive in their sexual contacts (above groups a-c), and those whose responses indicated them not to have been aggressive or coercive (above groups d-e).

Ethics Position Questionnaire (EPQ: Forsyth, 1980). The EPQ is a 20-item questionnaire measuring the respondent's ethical position on the two intersecting dimensions of Idealism and Relativism which underlie the ethical positions of Absolutism, Situationism, Subjectivism, and Exceptionism. Each item consists of a statement to which the subject responds using a 9-point Likert scale (1=completely disagree, 9=completely agree). Separate Idealism and Relativism scores are obtained from the instrument for each subject, as well as the S's ethical position which results from the crossing of these two dimensions. The Idealism score is obtained by taking the mean of the first 10 items on the questionnaire; the Relativism score is obtained by taking the mean of the remaining 10 items.

With respect to the ethical position typologies, Absolutists are high in Idealism and low in Relativism and are described as assuming that "the best possible outcome can always be achieved by following universal moral rules" (p. 176). Situationists are high in both Idealism and Relativism and are described as rejecting moral rules and advocating individualistic analysis of each act in each situation. Exceptionists are low in both Relativism and Idealism; they are described as using moral absolutes to guide judgments but being pragmatically open to exceptions to these standards. Subjectivists are low in

Idealism and high in Relativism; they base their moral appraisals on "personal values and perspective rather than universal moral principles" (p. 176). For purposes of subject classification in this study, Ss with scores of 5 or less on a particular scale were considered "low," and those with scores of 6 or greater were considered "high."

Forsyth (1980) reports the means for the Idealism and Relativism scales to be 6.35 (SD=1.17) and 6.18 (SD=1.13), respectively, based on a sample of 241 college students. Using the same sample, the intercorrelation between the two scales was found to be -.07. Both scales evidence good internal consistency based on Cronbach's alpha (Idealism=.80; Relativism=.73), and test-retest reliabilities over a two-week interval suggest reasonable scale stability (Idealism=.67; Relativism=.66). Evidence of the EPQ's concurrent, discriminant, and predictive validity are provide by Forsyth (1980).

Stanford Rape Education Project Questionnaire (SREPQ; Stanford Rape Education Project, 1988). The SREPQ is a self-report questionnaire designed to elicit information on one's own sexual experience (including experiences as a victim or perpetrator of coercive sex or rape), attitudes regarding coercive sex and perpetrators, and beliefs and attributions regarding coercive sex and its victims and perpetrators. No psychometric information is available on this instrument.

California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Gough, 1987). Three vector scales (the v.1, v.2, and v.3 subscales) from the CPI were used. The first two scales reflect the two primary structural factors of the instrument--(a) interpersonal involvement (v.1) and (b) norm acceptance (v.2). As reported by Gough, persons scoring higher on v.1 tend to be viewed as "reticent, shy, reserved, moderate, modest, and reluctant to initiate or take decisive social action" (p.18). Those scoring lower on the scale tend to be seen as "outgoing, confident, talkative, and as having social poise and presence" (p. 18). Those scoring higher on the v.2 are reported to be "well-organized, conscientious, conventional, dependable, and controlled" (p. 19); while those scoring lower tend to be described as "rebellious, restless, pleasure-seeking, and self-indulgent" (p. 19). The two vectors are

independent and uncorrelated; and when used in tandem, they create a four-fold personality typology. Using cutting scores provided in the CPI manual (Gough, 1987, p. 21), a personality typology could be assigned to each subject: Alpha's are low on v.1 and high on v.2; Beta's are high on v.1 and high on v.2; Gamma's are low on v.1 and low on v.2; Delta's are high on v.1 and low on v.2.

Superimposed on this four-fold classification system is the third dimension/vector (v.3) which measures the individual's competence, effectiveness and general adjustment/integration within his own typology. On this third vector, high scores/levels indicate superior adjustment/integration of the personality "type" identified by the first two vectors; low scores are suggestive of low adjustment/integration and some form of psychopathology (Megargee, 1989). Although they were not used in the present study, Gough (1987) offers cutting scores for v.3 to divide the scale into a normally distributed series of seven levels of classification. The intent of this classification is to "indicate the degree to which the positive potentiality for each type of life style has been realized" (pp. 21-22).

Based on a sample of 200 college males, Gough (1987) reports the internal consistency (alpha) of the vector scales to be .81 for v.1, .78 for v.2, and .85 for v.3. Test-retest reliabilities, based on a sample of 102 high school males over an approximate one-year interval, are reported to be .69 for v.1, .61 for v.2, and .75 for v.3.

Selfism Scale (also called the Narcissism Scale; NS; Phares & Erskine, 1984). This 40-item scale (12 of which are "filler" items) was developed to measure narcissism or "selfism" which is defined as an orientation, belief, or set affecting how one construes a whole range of situations that deal with the satisfaction of needs. The NS is scored by summing the scores of the 28 individual scorable items, each of which is on a 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Scores can range from 28 to 140, with higher scores indicative of a selfish or egocentric view of situations. Lower scores

are suggestive of individuals who tend to submerge their own satisfaction in favor of others.

Phares and Erskine (1984) report a mean of 77.91 for a sample of 150 undergraduate college males. As reported by Phares and Erskine, the scale has good internal consistency, with a split-half reliability of .84 for males. It has a 4-week test-retest correlation of .91. The NS has been found to correlate significantly and in the expected direction with the Narcissistic Personality Inventory, the Religious Attitude Scale and observers' judgments of their close friends' narcissistic characteristics.

Procedure

A packet containing copies of the instruments were sent to each of the 1000 randomly selected participants, along with instructions to return the completed instruments in a business return envelope that was included in the original packet. Subjects were asked not to include their name in the materials. The returned instruments did not contain personally identifying information, and no follow-up mailing was attempted.

Analyses

The Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) data categorized only a single participant within its first category (rape) and only six participants within its second category (attempted rape). While these proportions of the sample who admitted to rape or attempted rape (3%) were lower than for previous studies (e.g., 7.7% reported by Koss & Dinero, [1989]), the proportion of the sample who admitted to sexual coercion (24%) was considerably higher than that reported in previous studies (e.g., 7.2% reported by Koss & Dinero [1989]). In light of a planned discriminate function analysis, the decision was made to collapse the Ss into two groups: (1) those who admitted to rape, attempted rape, or to being sexually coercive (i.e., SES categories 1-3; N=63; 27%), and (2) those who were not otherwise classified as sexually assaultive or coercive (i.e., SES categories 4-5; N=171; 73%). So grouped, the proportion of subjects in the first group was greater than than expected from previous studies (e.g., 15% reported by Koss & Dinero [1989]).

The primary analysis was a discriminate function analysis conducted using the three CPI scales, the EPQ dimension scales, and the NS scale to predict SES category placement. Crosstabulations of CPI and EPQ types and SES categories also were conducted, and measures of association among these types/categories of subjects computed. Additional descriptive analysis using data from the SREPQ were used to supplement findings from this analysis and to address issues or assertions raised raised in previous writings.

Results

Table 1 summarizes the Ss scores on the EPQ, NS, and CPI scales for the two groups. On the EPQ, men in the sexually assaultive/coercive group were less idealistic and more relativistic; on the NS they were more egocentric/narcissistic; and on the CPI they were more external (v.1), more norm-questioning (v.2), and less integrated (v.3) than their nonassaultive/coercive counterparts. Univariate F-ratios computed as part of the discriminate function analysis revealed that these differences were significant only for v.1 ($F[1,232]=10.33$, $p<.01$), v.3 ($F[1,232]=13.05$, $p<.01$), and NS ($F([1,232]=21.94$, $p<.01$), however. With respect to the CPI scales, Ss categorized as sexually assaultive/coercive were less internal (v.1: M=11.3, SD=5.87) and less integrated (v.3: M=32.2, SD=9.1) than the nonassaultive/coercive Ss (v.1: M=14.2; SD=6.1; v.3: 37.1, SD=9.0). Of particular note is that Ss in the sexually assaultive/coercive group were below average in their integration and realization of potential, while Ss in the nonassaultive/coercive group were at least average in their integration and realization of potential. Although the nonassaultive/coercive group was not "high" on this scale, the below average mean for the assaultive/coercive group would suggest that they are likely to be uncomfortable with uncertainty, unsure of themselves, and dissatisfied.

The difference between groups on the NS scale suggests that those Ss who were categorized as sexually assaultive/coercive (M=85.8, SD=15.6) were more selfish or

egocentric in their orientation than those in the nonassaultive/coercive group (M=75.9; SD=13.9).

Insert Table 1 about here

A single significant discriminant function differentiated the assaultive/coercive and the noncoercive groups of men. Table 2 presents the standardized canonical discriminate function coefficients for this analysis.

Insert Table 2 about here

The discriminant function resulted in 66% of the participants being correctly classified to the two SES groups. A kappa coefficient (Cohen, 1960) computed on the classification results revealed that the discriminate function improved upon the classification of subjects as assaultive/coercive or nonassaultive/coercive over that which could be obtained simply by chance, $K=.258$, $p<.01$. This improvement in subject classification, although statistically significant, was so slight that it is of questionable meaningfulness.

A subsequent analysis revealed a significant difference in the subjects' ages in the two SES groups, with those Ss who admitted to sexual assault or coercion being older (M=21.1, SD=1.6) than those in the nonassaultive/coercive group (M=20.3, SD=1.4), $F(1,215)=12.63$, $p<.01$. Consequently, a second discriminate function analysis was conducted, this time including the subjects' age as a predictor variable. The results of this analysis varied only slightly from the initial analysis. The standardized canonical discriminate function coefficients for this second analysis are presented in Table 2. The second discriminant function resulted in 69% of the participants being correctly classified to the two SES groups, $K=.332$, $p<.01$. Again, the improvement over chance, although statistically significant, was of limited meaningfulness.

Crosstabulations of the Ss' various typologies--ethical ideology (Situationist, Absolutist, Subjectivist, Exceptionist), CPI type (Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta), and SES category (sexually assaultive/coercive, nonassaultive/coercive)--were conducted to explore possible relationships among sexual behavior and the various personality types. Tables 3 through 5 summarize these crosstabulations.

Insert Tables 3 thru 5 about here

Chi-square analysis revealed a pattern of relationship between Ss' SES type and their ethical ideology (see Table 3), χ^2 (3, N=146)=10.83, p<.01. In particular, Ss who were sexually assaultive/coercive were more likely to be Absolutists and less likely to be Subjectivists, while Ss who were not sexually assaultive/coercive were more likely to be Subjectivists and less likely to be Absolutists. A chi square analysis of Ss' SES type and their CPI type (see Table 4) was not significant, χ^2 (3, N=234)=2.36, NS. Additionally, no relationship was found between Ss' ethical ideology and their CPI type, χ^2 (9, N=146)=5.10, NS (see Table 5).

Since prior sexual victimization has been reported to relate to sexual assault, an analysis of the relationship between (a) sexual molestation or assault, (b) physical abuse, and (c) emotional abuse experienced by the Ss before the age of 18 and their SES group status was conducted. Information regarding Ss' history of sexual molestation, sexual assault, physical abuse, and emotional abuse was taken from Ss' responses to the SREPQ. Tables 6, 7 and 8, respectively, summarize the crosstabulations of Ss' SES category and previously experience sexual, physical and emotional abuse. Among our sample, 8.1% reported personally having experienced prior sexual molestation or assault, 3.4% reported prior physical abuse, and 13.8% reported prior emotional abuse. No relationship was found, however, between Ss' reports of sexual assaultiveness or coercion and (a) prior

sexual abuse, χ^2 (1, N=234)=.004, NS, (b) prior physical abuse, χ^2 (1, N=234)=2.24, NS, or (c) prior emotional abuse, χ^2 (1, N=232)=.04, NS.

Insert Tables 6 thru 8 about here

Since pornography has been implicated in leading to sexual assault (Koss & Dinero, 1989), an analysis of the relationship between Ss' use of pornography and their SES group status was conducted. Information regarding Ss' use of pornography was taken from Ss' responses to the SREPQ question, "I regularly read one or more of the following magazines: Playboy, Playgirl, Penthouse, Chic, Club, Forum, Gallery, Genesis, Oui or Hustler." Subjects had responded to this item using a 6-point Likert scale (1=Never, 6=Always). A significant difference was found in the frequency with which the above magazines were read between those Ss classified in the sexual assaultive/coercive group and those in the nonassaultive/coercive group, with those in the sexually assaultive/coercive group (M=3.3, SD=1.6) admitting to reading pornography more frequently than those in the nonassaultive/coercive group (M=2.6, SD=1.5), $F(1,228)=9.8$, $p<.001$.

Exploratory analyses (ANOVAs) of possible attitudinal differences between men in the sexually assaultive/coercive group and those in the nonassaultive/coercive group were conducted on two additional sets of questions from the SREPQ. Both sets of questions asked Ss to indicated their views using a 6-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree). Table 9 summarizes the questions and the results of those analyses. In contrast to the men in the nonassaultive/coercive group, men in the sexually assaultive/coercive group tended to agree more with the statement that "a woman is indicating an interest in, and willingness to have intercourse, if . . ." (a) she goes back to her date's room, $F(1,229)=10.65$, $p<.01$, (b) she kisses, $F(1,229)=9.66$, $p<.01$, and (c) she takes her pants off, $F(1,227)=6.18$, $p<.01$. They were also tended to agree more with

the view that "a man is entitled to full sexual activity . . ." (a) if he has treated someone to an expensive meal, $F(1,230)=11.20$, $p<.01$, (b) after dating someone several times, $F(1,230)=7.58$, $p<.01$, (c) when dating someone regularly, $F(1,229)=11.50$, $p<.01$, (d) if his partner is sending sexually enticing messages, $F(1,229)=4.88$, $p<.05$, (e) if his partner had agreed to engage in full sexual activity, but at the last minute changed her/his mind, $F(1,229)=4.59$, $p<.05$, and (f) if he and his partner have engaged in full sexual activity before, $F(1,229)=9.02$, $p<.01$. With respect to the second set of questions, it may be noted in Table 9 that there was trend toward increasing "entitlement" (i.e., increasing agreement) across the items. Although one must be very cautious when interpreting retention of the null hypothesis, it is interesting to note that there was not a significant difference between the two groups with respect to the last item in that group: "A man is entitled to full sexual activity . . . if he and his partner have engaged in foreplay" ; and both groups gave this item their highest agreement rating.

Insert Table 9 about here

Discussion

There appear to be at least some differences between males who admit to sexual assault or coercion and those who do not. Sexually coercive males were found to be more narcissistic than non sexually coercive males. Specifically, these males are more likely to satisfy their perceived needs in an egocentric or selfish fashion (Phares & Erskine, 1984) tending to disregard the needs of others.

Although there were no statistically significant differences between males who did and did not admit to sexually assaultive/coercive relationships on either of the individual EPQ scales (idealism, relativism), a significant relationship was found between the Ss' SES group their ethical position. Specifically, the sexually assaultive/coercive males were

more likely to be Absolutists, while those who were not sexually assaultive/coercive were more likely to be Subjectivistis. Absolutists reject the use of an action's consequences to make decisions and rely on universal moral rules. Situationists tend to make decisions based on their own personal values rather than universal moral principles (Forsyth, 1980). One might perceive that an individual who makes decisions based on their own values might be more likely to be assaultive/coercive. However, in light of the findings of the narcissism among the assaultive/coercive males, the universal moral rules may not be idealistic moral rules; rather, they may be the moral rules of the group. For young males the moral code of the group may be that they must "score" with their dates in order to be considered worthy among the rest of the males of their group. In contrast, individuals who base decisions on their own personal values may be less apt to be subject to the peer pressure of the group with which they are involved.

Table 9 suggests what some of the rules of conduct might be that differentiate assaultive/coercive and nonassaultive/coercive males. (In this instance, a rule of conduct may be viewed as, "I am entitled to full sexual activity if I pay for the date.") Although both groups of males, assaultive/coercive and nonassaultive/coercive, tended toward agreeing with entitlement of sexual activity based on the actions of their date, on the whole, neither group displayed a strong bias toward viewing sex with a partner as an "entitlement" (as evidenced by their tendency to disagree with the statements). Nevertheless, significant differences were found between the two groups with respect to their level of subscription to attitudes that they are entitled to full sexual activity given the various circumstances outlined in the question--with the assaultive/coercive males tending to reflect more of an entitlement attitude. Table 9 shows, for example, that there is a tendency to agree that if their partner has engaged in full sexual activity on a prior occasion, or if foreplay has occurred, then they are entitled to full sexual activity. Such a position is an acquired code of conduct or belief that may have been learned through interactions with peers.

With regards to the California Personality Inventory scales, sexually assaultive/coercive males were found to be higher on externality and less well integrated. More specifically, these males are likely to be uncomfortable with uncertainty, unsure of themselves, and dissatisfied in general. These characteristics along with the findings with regards to narcissism seem to fit well together. Often, persons who are self-indulgent and "me" oriented are thought to be insecure, unsure of themselves, and needing to look good in the eyes of others. Particularly in a college or university environment, incidence of sexual assault may be a result of fear of peer rejection--creating greater insecurity for these males and the need for achievement of a perceived "conquest" in order to create a particular image with one's peers.

Other significant findings were noted with regards to age and use of pornography. Older males were found to be more sexually assaultive or coercive than younger males. This finding may have to do with sexual experience and confidence as one grows older. The sexually coercive group also read more pornography such as Playboy, Playgirl, Penthouse, Chic, Club, Forum, Gallery, Genesis, Oui or Hustler. This finding concurs with the results of the research by Koss and Dinero (1989) who noted a correlation between sexual assault and the use of violent and degrading pornography.

Interestingly, the sexually assaultive/coercive group exhibited no significant findings compared to the nonassaultive/coercive group with regards to a history of prior sexual abuse, physical abuse, or emotional abuse. Other research regarding rape has not supported such a link between sexual assault/coercion and history of abuse. However, researchers have found that early exposure to highly erotic peer group socialization does correlate with sexual coercion including rape (Kanin, 1984). Oftentimes abuse that has occurred for individuals is not perceived as abuse unless something happens which forces such individuals to confront abusive events of their past.

Our sense of the data is that it appears that the characteristics of males who are sexually assaultive/coercive reflect rather ingrained personality styles that may not be

particularly amendable to change. In this regard, the educational and institutional responses to rape prevention that have focused on educating potential victims of assault and coercion about the prevalence of campus rape and date/acquaintance rape, "resistance" strategies, precautionary or self-protective measures, and on safety modifications of the campus environment are highly appropriate. However, educational interventions focused on perpetrators (or potential perpetrators) may be most effective if they attempt to challenge and create new "codes" of conduct among peer groups that members will agree to follow "absolutely." Such interventions may prove to be most effective if taken into the actual social groups (such as fraternal organizations) where peer pressure/support is rather intense on college campuses.

References

Abby, A. (1991). Acquaintance rape and alcohol consumption on college campuses: How are they linked? Journal of American College Health, 39, 165-168.

Adams, A., & Abarbanel, G. (1988). Sexual assault on campus: What colleges can do. Santa Monica, CA: Santa Monica Hospital Medical Center.

Aizenman, M., & Kelley, G. (1988). The incidence of violence and acquaintance rape in dating relationships among college men and women. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 305-311.

Benson, D., Charlton,C., & Goodhart, F. (1992). Acquaintance rape on campus: A literature review. Journal of American College Health, 40, 157-165.

Borden, L., Karr, S., & Caldwell-Colbert, A. (1988). Effects of a university rape prevention program on attitudes and empathy toward rape. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 132-136.

Byers, E. (1988). Effects of sexual arousal on men's and women's behavior in sexual disagreement situations. Journal of Sex Research, 25, 235-254.

Clagett, A. (1988). Theoretical consideration of forcible rape: A critical analysis. Psychology: A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior, 25, 10-17.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20, 37-46.

Cohen, P. (1984). Resistance during sexual assaults: Avoiding rape and injury. Victimology, 9, 120-129.

College Security Report (1989). Stanford survey reveals high rate of forced sex. College Security Report, 1 (12), 1-3.

Coller, S., & Resick, P. (1987). Women's attributions of responsibility for date rape: The influence of empathy and sex-role stereotyping. Violence and Victims, 2, 115-125.

Cornett, M., & Shuntich, R. (1991). Sexual aggression: Perceptions of its likelihood of occurring and some correlates of self-admitted perpetration. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 73, 499-507.

Dull, R., & Giacopassi, D. (1987). Demographic correlates of sexual and dating attitudes: A study of date rape. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14, 175-193.

Floerchinger, D. (1988). Dating can be dangerous: A program assessing student attitudes on campus. ERIC: ED305534.

Forsyth, D. (1980). A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 175-184.

Gough, H. (1987). California Psychological Inventory: Administrator's guide. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Hughes, J., & Sandler, D. (1987). "Friends" raping friends: Could it happen to you? ERIC: ED283471.

Jenkins, M., & Dambrot, F. (1987). The attribution of date rape: Observer's attitudes and sexual experiences and the dating situation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17, 875-895.

Kanin, E. J. (1984). Date rape: Unofficial criminals and victims. Victimology: An International Journal, 9, 95-108.

Koss, M. (1988). Hidden rape: Sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample in higher education. In A. Burgess (Ed.), Rape and sexual assault, II (pp. 3-25). New York: Garland.

Koss, M. & Dinero, T. (1989). Predictors of sexual aggression among a national sample of male college students. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 528, 133-147.

Koss, M., Dinero, T., Seibel, C., & Cox, S. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in the victim's experience? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 1-24.

Koss, M., & Gidycz, C. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 422-423.

Koss, M., Gidycz, C., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.

Koss, M., & Oros, C. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50, 455-457.

Levine-MacCombie, J., & Koss, M. (1986). Acquaintance rape: Effective avoidance strategies. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 311-320.

Malamuth, N. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. Journal of Social Issues, 37, 138-157.

Malamuth, N. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 953-962.

Megargee, E. (August, 1989). The California Psychological Inventory: Recent developments. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Miller, B. (1988). Date rape: Time for a new look at prevention. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 53-55.

Miller, B., & Marshall, J. (1987). Coercive sex on the university campus. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 38-47.

Muehlenhard, C., & Linton, M. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 186-196.

Neff, L. (1988). Acquaintance rape on campus: The problem, the victims, and prevention. NASPA Journal, 25, 146-152.

Phares, E., & Erskine, N. (1984). The measurement of selfism. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 44, 597-608.

Predue, W., Lester, D. (1972). Personality characteristics of rapists. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 32, 514.

Rader, C. (1977). MMPI profile types of exposers, rapists, and assaulters in a court services population. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 61-69.

Rapaport, K., & Burkhart, B. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93, 216-221.

Renner, K., & Wackett, C. (1987). Sexual assault: Social and stranger rape. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 6, 49-56.

Russell, D. (1982). The prevalence and incidence of forcible rape and attempted rape of females. Victimology, 7, 81-93.

Scully, D., & Marjolla, J. (1984). Convicted rapists' vocabulary of motive: Excuses and justifications. Social Problems, 31, 530-543.

Speas, R., & Thorpe, C. (1979). Campus attitudes toward rape: Some reflections of Black college students, ERIC: ED178824.

Stanford Rape Education Project (1988). Stanford Rape Education Project Questionnaire. Unpublished instrument, Stanford University, Rape Education Project (REP), Palo Alto, CA.

Torrey, S., & Lee, R. (1987). Curbing date violence: Campus-wide strategies. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 51, 3-8.

Tetreault, R., & Barnett, M. (1987). Reactions to stranger and acquaintance rape. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 353-358.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of the Ethical Positions Questionnaire (EPQ), the Selfism Scale (NS), and California Psychological Inventory (CPI) Scales by Group

	Sexually Coercive/Assaultive Coercive/Assaultive		Not Sexually			
Scale	M	SD	M	SD	df	F
EPQ[1]						
Idealism	5.92	1.72	6.33	1.61	1, 232	2.93
Relativism	5.83	1.42	5.64	1.59	1, 232	.72
NS[2]	85.78	15.61	75.88	13.85	1, 232	21.94**
CPI[3]						
v.1 (internality/externality)	11.30	5.87	14.16	6.09	1, 232	10.33**
v.2 (norm-following norm-questionning)	20.89	5.01	21.43	5.18	1, 232	.51
v.3 (integration)	32.32	9.13	37.13	9.02	1, 232	13.05**

[1] Ethics Position Questionnaire (Forsyth, 1980)
[2] Narcissism Scale (Phares & Erskine, 1984)
[3] California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1988)

**p<.01

Table 2

Standardized Canonical Discriminate Function Coefficients for the Functions Derived in the Two Analyses of SES Category (Sexually Assaultive/Coercive vs. Nonassaultive/Coercive)

Variable	Standardized Canonical Discriminate Function Coefficients	Correlation with the Canonical Discriminate Function
Analysis 1		
Idealism	.244	.278
Relativism	.050	-.138
Narcissism/Selfism	-.590	-.061
v.1 (internality/externality)	.481	.522
v.2 (norm-following/questioning)	-.082	.115
v.3 (integration)	.424	.587
Analysis 2		
Idealism	-.093	-.166
Relativism	-.073	.122
Narcissism/Selfism	.465	.620
v.1 (internality/externality)	-.428	-.413
v.2 (norm-following/questioning)	.128	-.056
v.3 (integration)	-.451	-.495
Age	.593	.527

Table 3

Frequency Crosstabulation of Ethics Position Type and SES Type

Sexual Experiences Type (SES)	Ethics Position Type				
	Situationist	Absolutist	Subjectivist	Exceptionist	Row Total
Sexual Assaultive/ Coercive	15	7	8	6	36
Nonassaultive/ Coercive	52	39	6	13	110
Column Total	67	46	14	19	146[1]

[1] Total reflects 88 missing observations

χ^2 (3, N=146)=10.83, p<.01

Table 4

Frequency Crosstabulation of CPI Personality Type and SES Type

Sexual Experience Type (SES)	CPI Personality Type				Row Total
	Alpha	Beta	Gamma	Delta	
Sexual Assaultive/ Coercive	27	5	25	6	63
Nonassaultive/ Coercive	66	18	59	29	171
Column Total	93	23	84	34	234

χ^2 (3, N=234)=2.36, NS

Table 5

Frequency Crosstabulation of Ethics Position Type and CPI Type

CPI Type	Ethics Position Type				
	Situationist	Absolutist	Subjectivist	Exceptionist	Row Total
Alpha Type	28	21	5	6	60
Beta Type	4	4	2	3	13
Gamma Type	24	13	6	8	51
Delta Type	11	8	1	2	22
Column Total	67	46	14	19	146[1]

[1] Total reflects 88 missing observations

χ^2 (9, N=146)=5.10, NS

Table 6

Frequency Crosstabulation of Subjects by SES Category (Sexual assaultive/coercive vs. Nonassaultive/Coercive) and Prior History of Sexual Molestation or Assault (Yes/No)

	"Were you sexually molested or assaulted before the age of 18?"		
SES Category	Yes	No	Row Total (and Percent)
Sexually Assaultive/ Coercive	5	58	63 (26.9)
Not Sexually Assaultive/ Coercive	14	157	171 (73.1)
Column Total (and Percent)	19 (8.1)	215 (91.9)	234 (100.0)

χ^2 (N=234, df=1)=.004, NS

Table 7

Frequency Crosstabulation of Subjects by SES Category (Sexual assaultive/coercive vs. Nonassaultive/Coercive) and Prior History of Physical Abuse (Yes/No)

	"Were you physically abused before the age of 18?"		
SES Category	Yes	No	Row Total (and Percent)
Sexually Assaultive/ Coercive	4	59	63 (26.9)
Not Sexually Assaultive/ Coercive	4	167	171 (73.1)
Column Total (and Percent)	8 (3.4)	226 (96.6)	234 (100.0)

χ^2 (N=234, df=1)=2.24, NS

Table 8

Frequency Crosstabulation of Subjects by SES Category (Sexual assaultive/coercive vs. Nonassaultive/Coercive) and Prior History of Emotional Abuse (Yes/No)

	"Were you emotionally abused before the age of 18?"		
SES Category	Yes	No	Row Total (and Percent)
Sexually Assaultive/ Coercive	9	53	62 (26.7)
Not Sexually Assaultive/ Coercive	23	147	170 (73.3)
Column Total[1] (and Percent)	32 (13.8)	200 (86.2)	232 (100.0)

[1] Total reflects 2 missing observations

χ^2 (N=232, df=1)=.04, NS

Table 9

Exploratory Analyses (ANOVAs) of Differences in the Sexual Attitudes of Sexually Assaultive/Coercive and Nonassaultive/Coercive College Men

SREPQ Item	Sexually Assaultive/ Coercive Men M	SD	Nonassaultive/ Coercive Men M	SD	df	F
On a date, a woman is indicating an interest in, and a willingness to have intercourse if . . .						
a. she goes back to her date's room	2.48	1.53	1.94	1.18	1, 229	10.65**
b. she kisses	2.24	1.34	1.72	.89	1,229	9.66**
c. she French kisses	2.41	1.39	2.01	1.23	1, 229	3.50
d. she takes her shirt off	3.69	1.50	3.19	1.64	1, 227	3.68
e. she takes her pants off	4.75	1.44	4.08	1.71	1, 227	6.18**
f. she gives verbal consent	5.89	.36	5.73	.65	1, 227	3.23
A man is entitled to full sexual activity[1] . . .						
a. if he has treated someone to an expensive meal	1.56	1.17	1.16	.43	1, 230	11.20**
b. after dating someone several times	1.75	1.22	1.35	.68	1,230	7.58**
c. when dating someone regularly	2.27	1.50	1.68	1.01	1, 229	11.50**
d. if his partner is sending sexually enticing messages	2.79	1.59	2.33	1.37	1, 229	4.88*

Table 9 (cont.)

SREPQ Item	Sexually Assaultive/ Coercive Men M	SD	Nonassaultive/ Coercive Men M	SD	df	F
A man is entitled to full sexual activity[1] . . .						
e. if his partner had agreed to engage in full sexual activity, but at the last minute change her/his mind	1.97	1.29	1.63	.93	1,229	4.59*
f. if he and his partner have engaged in full sexual activity before	2.95	1.62	2.32	1.38	1, 229	9.02**
g. if he and his partner have just engaged in foreplay	2.95	1.68	2.53	1.50	1, 229	3.40

[1] "Full sexual activity" refers to vaginal, anal, or oral intercourse.

* $p<.05$

** $p<.01$